

Re: [RFC,PATCH] loopback: calls netif\_receive\_skb() instead of netif\_rx()

## Re: [RFC,PATCH] loopback: calls netif\_receive\_skb() instead of netif\_rx()

---

*Source:* <http://linux.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/Kernel/2008-03/msg11920.html>

---

- *From:* Ingo Molnar <mingo@xxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Mon, 31 Mar 2008 11:48:23 +0200
- 

\* Eric Dumazet <dada1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

I noticed some paths in kernel are very stack aggressive, and on i386 with CONFIG\_4KSTACKS we were really in a dangerous land, even without my patch.

What we call 4K stacks is in fact 4K – sizeof(struct task\_struct), so a little bit more than 2K. [...]

that's just wrong – 4K stacks on x86 are 4K–sizeof(thread\_info) – the task struct is allocated elsewhere. The patch below runs just fine on 4K–stack x86.

Ingo

----->

Subject: net: loopback speedup  
From: Ingo Molnar <mingo@xxxxxxx>  
Date: Mon Mar 31 11:23:21 CEST 2008

Signed-off-by: Ingo Molnar <mingo@xxxxxxx>

---

drivers/net/loopback.c | 2 +-  
1 file changed, 1 insertion(+), 1 deletion(-)

Index: linux/drivers/net/loopback.c

=====

--- linux.orig/drivers/net/loopback.c  
+++ linux/drivers/net/loopback.c  
@@ -158,7 +158,7 @@ static int loopback\_xmit(struct sk\_buff  
lb\_stats->bytes += skb->len;  
lb\_stats->packets++;  
  
- netif\_rx(skb);  
+ netif\_receive\_skb(skb);

Re: [RFC,PATCH] loopback: calls netif\_receive\_skb() instead of netif\_rx()

Re: [RFC,PATCH] loopback: calls netif\_receive\_skb() instead of netif\_rx()

```
return 0;  
}
```

--

To unsubscribe from this list: send the line "unsubscribe linux-kernel" in the body of a message to majordomo@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

More majordomo info at <http://vger.kernel.org/majordomo-info.html>

Please read the FAQ at <http://www.tux.org/lkml/>